

MINUTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
REGIONAL BICYCLE TASK FORCE AND THE PEDESTRIAN WORKING GROUP

Tuesday, January 13, 2004 1:30 p.m.
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 - Cholla Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Tami Ryall, Gilbert, Chair, Regional Bicycle Task Force	*Scott Lininger, Maricopa County Mark Venti, Mesa
*Vacant, Chair, Pedestrian Working Group	*Karen Flores, Peoria
Bruce Meyers, Az. Dept. of Admin.	*Tim Bolton, Peoria
Anna Roedler, Avondale	*Shawny Ekadis, Queen Creek
Michael Eagan, Az. Society of Landscape Arch.	Briiana Leon, Phoenix
Bill Lazenby, Coalition of Az. Bicyclists	Katherine Wisheart, Phoenix
*Michael Ohland, Chandler	Amy Corathers for Scott Hamilton, Scottsdale
Michael Normand, Chandler	Eric Iwersen, Tempe
Steve Hancock, Glendale	Susan Tierney for Randi Alcott, Valley Metro
Janeen Gaskin, Goodyear	
Mike Cartsonis, Litchfield Park	

*Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

OTHERS PRESENT

Dawn Coomer, MAG	Amy MacAulay, AMAC Consulting
Maureen DeCindis, MAG	Carl Whaley

1. Call to Order

Chairman Tami Ryall, Regional Bicycle Task Force, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Approval of the December 16, 2003 Meeting Minutes of the Pedestrian Working Group and the Regional Bicycle Task Force

Michael Normand moved to approve and Steve Hancock seconded the motion to approve the minutes from the December 16, 2003 meeting of the Regional Bicycle Task Force and the Pedestrian Working Group. The motion passed unanimously.

3. Call to the Audience

An opportunity was provided to members of the public to address the Pedestrian Working Group and Regional Bicycle Task Force on items not scheduled on the agenda that fall under the jurisdiction of MAG, or on items on the agenda for discussion but not for action. Citizens were requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes was provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item.

No one in the audience wished to address the committee.

4. Staff Report

Maureen DeCindis reminded the members to sign up for the conference entitled "*Trails for All People — Accessibility on Arizona's Trails.*" MAG is co-sponsoring the conference with the Arizona State Committee on Trails (ASCOT) on February 27, 2004. The cost is only \$35.00 for the conference.

Applications for bicycle and pedestrian projects for the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) are due on February 8, 2004. The amount of Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds available for FY 2008 is \$41 million and for 2009 are \$42.5 million. The amount available for bicycle and pedestrian projects will probably be about \$6.8 million/year. The application forms are available on the MAG website.

On December 5, 2003, MAG sent a letter to Management Committee and other modal committees notifying them that there is now \$200,000 available for the 2004 Pedestrian Design Assistance program. The due date for applications is February 13, 2003. The application and an Applicant Guidebook are on the MAG web site.

5. Member Agency Report

Committee members were invited to provide an update of pedestrian and bicycle planning activity in their agencies.

Eric Iwersen reported that the city of Tempe deputy public works manager Mary O'Connor will take a new position at the city of Scottsdale to become the Scottsdale Transportation Manager.

Amy Corathers reported that Michelle Korf will take a new position to help develop city of Scottsdale downtown.

Katherine Wisheart reported that the Esplanade pedestrian bridge will now be an underbridge. The road will be raised by six feet creating space underneath the road for pedestrians to cross. It will be shaped like an eye with a plaza leading into it. Premier Engineering is designing the underbridge.

The city of Mesa hired Jeff Kramer as their new Transportation Director.

Michael Normand said that Chandler has started design on the Western Canal bike path from Price Road to Hamilton Road.

6. New Member

At the December meeting, the MAG Pedestrian Working Group and the MAG Regional Bicycle Task Force addressed the issue of potential new membership to the committees. Based on committee comments over the past several months, staff summarized key issues for members:

A. What constituencies should be represented other than MAG members?

The following constituencies could be considered:

- Safety
- Elderly
- Environmental
- Persons with disabilities
- Health and wellness
- Bike shop owners
- Trails associations

B. How many positions should be available for non-MAG representatives?

There are 25 cities and towns, Maricopa County and two Native American communities that are members of MAG. Currently, 12 jurisdictions and two organizations on the Regional Bicycle Task Force and 12 jurisdictions and three organizations on the Pedestrian Working Group are active.

C. What is the process for membership selection?

- A candidate must hold qualifications that exhibit expertise relevant to regional bicycle and/or pedestrian issues in order to provide a broader base of knowledge to the committee.
- A candidate must be nominated by and represent a constituency whose mission is relevant to regional bicycle and/or pedestrian issues. A letter from an organization nominating a member would be required.
- If a potential candidate has previously worked for a jurisdiction, the candidate should wait one year post employment before applying for membership on the bicycle or pedestrian committee. (Please note that this item is not a requirement presently enforced by other MAG Committees. Also, the process of waiting for a period of one full year

after employment would be invalidated if a current member begins employment with another jurisdiction, who then appoints that person to the Committee).

- According to MAG By-Laws, all committee members are appointed by the Chair of the Regional Council.

D. Should the non-MAG representatives be allowed to vote?

E. MAG committees allow every member to vote. The Transportation Review Committee has members with ex-officio status who don't vote because they work for a city that already has a vote on that committee.

After the presentation, Steve Hancock suggested that ethnicity and schools should be added to the constituencies and that the application should be judged based on professional associations. The committee might want to consider having three citizen representatives and not necessarily define the associations.

Amy Corathers commented that citizens could be general representatives of the community and thus give credibility on funding decisions. Amy Corathers asked if the committee wanted to limit the number of agencies. Janeen Gaskin suggested that the committee set a limit.

Anna Roedler asked what the role of the new committee members would be. For example, would the new members provide expertise? Is there a concern that the new members might vote according to the city that they live in?

Tami Ryall suggested that new members could vote on every issue except funding for the Transportation Improvement Projects (TIP) projects. Dawn Coomer asked if that also included not voting on the Pedestrian Design Assistance projects. Michael Egan concurred that non-city members should not vote on funding projects.

Janeen Gaskin suggested that only city representatives vote on funding issues.

A memo from Bill Lazenby was read to the committee: "I will not be able to attend the meeting tomorrow afternoon. I definitely want my YES vote for Susan Bookspan to be a member of the committee. As a member, I want all members to cast a vote. We are all professional and I am against any type of second class members."

Tami Ryall asked for a motion. Michael Normand moved that membership be opened up to advisory members who would not vote on funding issues and Janeen Gaskin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Anna Roedler suggested that up to five new members could be added. Michael Egan suggested that no more than a third new members be added. It was decided that no decision will be made

at this time about how many non-jurisdictional members should be accepted. Tami Ryall stated that each application should be discussed and considered as it is introduced. If the amount of applications become overwhelming, then the committee could discuss instituting a cap.

Steve Hancock wants to make sure that the representative is germane to bicycle and pedestrian issues.

Michael Normand made a motion that the constituency list be general enough to allow broad expertise relevant to bicycle and pedestrian issues. Katherine Wisheart and Eric Iwersen supported that idea Anna Roedler seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Tami Ryall summed up the selection process. A candidate will submit a cover letter indicating their interest and expertise, a resume and a letter representing a constituency. The candidate will be accepted after a simple quorum vote.

7. Review Panel for On-Call Consultant List

MAG issued a Request for Qualifications seeking qualified consultants for the On-Call Consultant List for the MAG Pedestrian Design Assistance Program. The due date for proposals is February 13, 2004. MAG staff asked for volunteers from the Working Group to serve on a review panel for the proposals. The review panel will likely meet the last week of February or first week of March. Consultant interviews are not anticipated.

Katherine Wisheart, Eric Iwerson and Amy Corathers volunteered to review the consultant proposals.

8. Discussion of Project Selection Process for the Regional Transportation Plan

In the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), \$132 million dollars has been set-aside for bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs over the 20 years. This represents approximately \$6.80 million a year for bicycle and pedestrian projects for the 20 years in the RTP.

Maureen DeCindis conducted a powerpoint presentation on the Pedestrian Activated Signal Crossing based on the Regional Off-Street System Plan recommendations and the ITE publication entitled "Alternative Treatments for At-Grade Pedestrian Crossings".

Tami Ryall reported that Gilbert has successfully installed one pedestrian activated signal crossing. Amy MacAulay said that traffic engineers main objections were that the red light remains in the on-position when the pedestrian is well onto the other side. Maureen DeCindis responded that according to the ITE publication, new technology has addressed that problem. When the pedestrian has crossed the street, the light automatically returns to green. Michael Cartsonis noted that these types of crossings would expedite the completion of an interconnected off-street system throughout the Valley. Eric Iwersen stressed that this is a very

important issue and these types of crossings should also be considered at transit stops. Mark Venti pointed out that in the city of Mesa all canal work includes electrical conduit in order to be able to install signal crossings at a future date.

Dawn Coomer conducted a powerpoint presentation on each of the following issues from the Attachment B that was included in the member packet.

The new Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) provides \$6.8 million annually for bicycle and pedestrian projects using Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding. The percentage split of MAG CMAQ funding in the RTP is provided in **Table 1**. The RTP provides limited guidance on the implementation of the bicycle and pedestrian component of the Plan, with the following exception:

- Modal “firewalls” are provided for each mode identified in the Plan. These firewalls protect the overall percentage of CMAQ that will go to bicycle and pedestrian projects. Therefore, if the amount of CMAQ coming to the region is more or less than the expected \$40 million each year, bicycle and pedestrian projects will receive 17 percent of the CMAQ funding.

Because the RTP did not specifically address specific implementation of projects, the following issues need to be addressed by the Regional Bicycle Task Force (RBTF) and Pedestrian Working Group (PWG). For each issue, a staff recommendation is provided for discussion and consideration by the RBTF and PWG. The issues include:

- Modal split for funding allocation between bicycle projects and pedestrian projects.
- Match required for bicycle projects and pedestrian projects.
- Project selection and evaluation criteria.
- Eligibility requirements.
- Project application.
- Project cancellation, deferment and acceleration.

Table 1: Percentage Split of MAG CMAQ Funds in the RTP

	Freeways	Streets	Light Rail	Bicycle and Pedestrian	Air Quality	Total
Percentage	19.10%	13.40%	35.90%	17.00%	14.60%	100.00%
Amount	\$7.6	\$5.4	\$14.4	\$6.8	\$5.8	\$40.0

Notes:

1. Amounts are in millions of dollars, annually, and are based on the expected receipt of \$40 million in CMAQ Obligation Authority each year. The actual dollar allocations will depend on the total amount of CMAQ funding available each year.
2. The Freeways category Includes High Occupancy Vehicle lanes and Freeway Management System Projects.
3. Streets projects are further split between intersection projects (\$2.8 million, or 55/105 of the amount) and ITS projects (\$2.56 million, or 50/105 of the amount).
4. No subdivision stated between bicycle and pedestrian projects.

MODAL SPLIT FOR FUNDING ALLOCATION

Should the split be determined initially, and apply over the 20 year life of the RTP, or be set for a specific period of time? How often should the split be reviewed, and/or revised?

Staff Recommendation: The modal split should be determined for a specified period of time and subject to periodic review (two to five year increments).

Pros:

- Creates a balance between flexibility and choice of MAG member agencies to redirect resources where needed most at the time, while ensuring predictability of available funding sources over an extended period of time.
- Creates “firewalls” between the two modes to ensure that funding goes to both bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Cons:

- May limit the ability to take advantage of “one time only” opportunities, if these opportunities exceed the established modal split.

When should the modal split be determined – prior to the call for projects or after projects are received?

Staff Recommendation: The modal split should be determined prior to the call for projects.

Pros:

- Allows for internal prioritization by member agencies.
- Ensures that funding goes to projects that are “purely pedestrian,” as well as bicycle and shared-use path projects.

Cons:

- Limits flexibility of the RBTF and PWG to select projects which may meet local needs that are currently unknown.

What criteria should be used to determine the modal split?

Perhaps the simplest way to split the funding is 50 percent for bicycle/shared use path projects, and 50 percent for pedestrian projects. Or, perhaps 60 percent for bicycle/shared use path projects would be more appropriate since there appear to be more of those types of projects, and the bicycle/shared use path project is more inclusive.

In prior years, the modal split has been determined by the Transportation Review Committee. The modal split for bicycle/shared-use path and pedestrian projects in the FY 2003-2007

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is provided in **Table 2**, below. Although this table can provide some guidance on how to split the funding among different projects, the modal split should ideally be determined based on the relative need of the modes, and the goals of the transportation system.

Table 2: Bicycle/Shared Use Path and Pedestrian Projects in the FY 2003-2007 TIP (CMAQ Funding Only)

Year	Bicycle Projects	Pedestrian Projects	Total	Percent Bicycle	Percent Pedestrian
FY 2003	\$5,129,197	\$446,315	\$5,575,512	92.00%	8.00%
FY 2004	\$8,465,790	\$1,208,214	\$9,674,004	87.51%	12.49%
FY 2005	\$2,994,189	\$612,626	\$3,606,815	83.01%	16.99%
FY 2006	\$5,354,491	\$864,800	\$6,219,291	86.09%	13.91%
FY 2007	\$7,223,100	\$2,475,000	\$9,698,100	74.48%	25.52%
Total	\$29,166,767	\$5,606,955	\$34,773,722	83.88%	16.12%
Bicycle Improvement Type, FY 2003-2007 TIP					
		Funding	Percent		
Grade Separation		\$13,457,370	46.14%		
Shared-Use Path		\$13,621,957	46.70%		
Not Specified		\$230,000	0.79%		
Other		\$650,000	2.23%		
Striped Bicycle Lane		\$1,207,440	4.14%		
Total		\$29,166,767	100.00%		

Perhaps another way to determine the split is to select focus areas from year to year. For example, perhaps a focus one year could be to provide pedestrian projects in downtown areas. Or, another year could focus on constructing street crossings for off-street corridors in the Regional Off-Street System Plan.

Staff Recommendation: For FY 2008 and FY 2009 programming, provide 80 percent of funding to bicycle/shared-use path projects, and 20 percent of funding to pedestrian projects. If desired by the RBTF and PWG, this issue could be addressed again in future programming cycles.

Pros:

- This approach is simple and treats the two modes in a manner similar to prior years.
- Allows for discussion when additional time is available.

Cons:

- Ideally, the modal split should be determined based on the relative need of the two modes, and the goals of the transportation system.

After the presentation, Dawn Coomer led a discussion on each of the issues. She first asked if the committee would want to determine a modal split of the \$6.8 million between bike and pedestrian projects and if this decision should be designated for a specified period of time.

Tami Ryall suggested that both the bicycle and pedestrian committees combine and then a modal split would not have to be decided. Dawn Coomer requested that the discussion on combining the committees be deferred to a future agenda meeting.

Amy Corathers said that Scottsdale would not like to see a modal split identified. Eric Iwersen suggested that projects should be ranked based on merit of the projects and not confined to a modal split. Anna Roedler agreed. Dawn Coomer reminded the committees that in the past the Transportation Review Committee has determined the modal split for the committees.

Anna Roedler moved that for the next two years the committees should not identify a modal split allocation. Janeen Gaskin seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

Tami Ryall asked MAG staff to identify the nuances of the decision to combine the committees and present their findings at a future meeting.

Should a set-aside be provided for programs, such as education and encouragement, walk to school programs, etc.?

Both the Regional Bicycle Plan and the Regional Off-Street System Plan include goals and recommendations that advocate for educational and encouragement activities. The Pedestrian Plan 2000 also advocates for education and encouragement activities.

For example, the Education Goal of the Regional Bicycle Plan is *to increase public awareness of safer bicycling behaviors and the need for bicyclists and motorists to share the road. A secondary goal is to educate engineers and planners on bicycle issues.* Objectives include:

- *Develop public information projects to educate bicyclists about the need to operate a bicycle using the same rules and behaviors used in operating a motor vehicle. Promote use of bicycle helmets.*
- *Develop public information projects to educate motorists on the special needs of bicyclists in traffic and how to accommodate their presence on the roadway.*
- *Support ongoing or develop start-up child and adult bicycle safety education programs. This can include the production or purchase of printed and electronic materials such as brochures, posters, video tapes, etc. Support bicycle safety education classes by certified instructors and trained police officers.*

Goal II, Public Awareness, of the Pedestrian Plan 2000 is *to develop a variety of educational programs to promote the benefits of pedestrian-oriented design. Initiate demonstration projects to illustrate these benefits using potential pedestrian demand and pedestrian design techniques.* Objectives include:

- *Objective 2.2: Conduct public education and involvement campaigns to assist and encourage people to walk.*

- Objective 2.3: *Promote workplace walking incentive programs.*
- Objective 2.5: *Improve motorists' understanding of the need to share the roadway with non-motorized travelers, especially at intersections and crosswalks.*
- Objective 2.6: *Implement pedestrian safety education programs to improve observance of traffic laws, and to promote safety for pedestrians of all ages.*

Staff Recommendation: Create a five percent set-aside of funding for on-going educational and encouragement programs. This set-aside could include items such as publication of the Regional Bikeways map, regional education programs, and regional walk to school programs.

Pros:

- Providing a set-aside for education and encouragement programs would demonstrate support for these programs, and help to implement the adopted regional plans.
- Providing a continual stream of funding ensures program continuity.

Cons:

- Providing dedicated funding to education and encouragement activities would limit the amount of funds available for other types of projects, such as construction

Steve Hancock asked if educational programs were eligible for CMAQ funds. Dawn Coomer responded that they were eligible. Tami Ryall asked if MAG staff could continue to explore the availability of funds through UPWP for educational projects.

Eric Iwersen stated that the education projects should compete on their own merits with construction projects. Tami Ryall state that it is hard to score educational projects in the same way that construction projects are scored. Amy Corathers expressed the concern that on-going education programs are important but should not funded through CMAQ.

Steve Hancock estimated that 5% of the \$6.8 million budget is about \$340,000 and that amount is not enough for education and promotion programs. Tami Ryall responded that the education funds seemed to vaporize without impact unless a before and after assessment accompanies each educational effort, however, the bike map is very important. Eric Iwersen suggested that local communities could create pilot educational projects.

Susan Tierney noted that an education program that ties into other efforts would be more regional and cost effective. Also, education programs can be forwarded very easily in the TIP to be funded sooner than construction projects. She compared the MAG program to a corporate model in which most corporations set aside funding for education. This insures a stream of funding for on-going education.

Dawn Coomer reminded the committee that if the committee does not vote on this issue, then education projects will compete as they usually do with construction projects.

Steve Hancock made a motion to set aside for 10% annually for education programs. The motion was seconded by Susan Tierney. The motion was approved by Steve Hancock and Susan Tierney. All other committee members voted no. The motion did not carry.

Eric Iwersen made a motion that education programs continue to be evaluated along with construction projects. Brianna Leon seconded the motion. Susan Tierney opposed the motion with all the other committee members agreeing. The motion carried.

PROJECT MATCH

CMAQ funding is required to have a 5.7 percent local match in the region. Within the past five years, both the RBTF and PWG have discussed options to distribute constrained funding to more member agencies. The RBTF has adopted match requirements for bicycle and shared-use path/trail projects:

Federal Amount Requested	Local Match
Up to \$500,000	5.7% of the total project cost
\$500,001 to \$750,000	20% of the total project cost
Greater than \$750,000	20% or more of the total project cost – <i>it is strongly recommended that the match exceed 20%.</i>

The PWG has also adopted an increased match requirements for more expensive projects, using the same scale as the RBTF. However, in recent years, this information has mistakenly been omitted from the project application form for federally funded pedestrian project requests.

The Regional Transportation Plan requires a 20 percent match for freeway and transit projects, and 30 percent local match for regional street projects. It is important to note that during the close-out process each year, increasing the federal share of a project match is an eligible project for federal funding. Therefore, while bicycle and shared-use path projects requesting more than \$500,000 in federal funds are required to match with 20 percent local funds, the local match can be lowered, in some cases, to 5.7 percent during the close-out process.

Staff Recommendation: Ensure consistency between different transportation modes by requiring a minimum of 20 percent local match for all bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Pros:

- Treats all transportation modes fairly by requiring a minimum of 20 percent local match for all transportation projects.
- Creates fairness between bicycle/shared use path and pedestrian projects by having the same local match for both projects.

Cons:

- This match is higher than that used in the past on bicycle and pedestrian projects, and the higher match may limit member agency options for funding projects.

Janeen Gaskin noted that the City of Goodyear and all other small cities will not be able to get bicycle and pedestrian projects funded through their cities if the match required was as high as 20%. Tami Ryall stated that cities could come back and ask for increase funding at the close-out process. Projects programmed at 20% can request funds to bring the match back to 5.7%.

Katherine Wisheart suggested that the committee put forth a statement in support of the lower match for bicycle and pedestrian projects. Janeen Gaskin moved that bicycle and pedestrian projects retain the match scale as it currently exists. Anna Roedler seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

PROJECT SELECTION AND EVALUATION

Does the current application form need to be changed?

The application form remains as is for FY 2008 and FY 2009 projects. However, the form can be changed for future funding rounds.

Staff Recommendation: The RBTF and PWG should reevaluate the existing federal project application forms after reviewing and recommending projects for FY 2008 and FY 2009.

This discussion was tabled for a future agenda.

Should the RBTF and PWG review the bicycle and pedestrian elements of other regional transportation projects and determine that an appropriate bicycle and/or pedestrian facility is provided? If yes, how?

The RBTF and PWG have written two letters to the MAG Transportation Policy Committee which request a policy that institutionalizes bicycle and pedestrian elements by incorporating them into every federally and regionally funded transportation project, according to nationally accepted design standards and guidelines previously adopted by Regional Council.

New this year, the project application form for the FY 2005-2009 TIP asks specific questions about all transportation projects to assess the type of bicycle and/or pedestrian facility included in the transportation project. These questions ask applicants to describe:

- How the planned facility meets the guidance in the MAG Pedestrian Plan 2000, MAG Pedestrian Area Policies and Design Guidelines; MAG Regional Bicycle Plan, and MAG Regional Off-Street System Plan.
- How the facility meets the needs of older adults.

The MAG Transportation Review Committee has created a policy sub-committee that will examine the elements of the regional street program funded as part of the proposed sales tax extension. Part of this review will include the type of bicycle and/or pedestrian facility required as part of a regional street project.

Staff Recommendations: The RBTF and PWG should provide comment on federally funded freeway and street projects. This review should be incorporated into the ranking process by the other modal committees. The review could occur at a separate meeting of the RBTF and PWG, or concurrently by having a representative of the RBTF and PWG attend the modal committee meetings.

The RBTF and PWG should review the TIP forms for all modes to be sure that appropriate information, necessary to evaluate bicycle and pedestrian elements of projects, is included.

The RBTF and PWG ex-officio members on the Transportation Review Committee should provide input on the policy sub-committee that will determine the type of bicycle and/or pedestrian facility included in regional street projects.

Pros:

- The reviews of projects by the RBTF and PWG can help ensure that appropriate bicycle and pedestrian facilities are provided in every federally funded transportation project.
- Participation on the TRC sub-committee can assure that regional street projects

Dawn Coomer reminded the committee that the Transportation Review Committee has established two policy committees that will address policies for street projects in the Regional Transportation Plan and that Eric Iwersen and Randi Alcott will be representing the bicycle and pedestrian concerns on those committees.

Amy Corathers asked if the bicycle and pedestrian committees had the time and resources to review all the streets projects.

Janeen Gaskin asked if the committees could just change the streets applications in order to add a series of bicycle and pedestrian questions to insure that the cities have addressed these needs. Dawn Coomer responded that for the years 2008 and 2009, MAG staff did add more bicycle and pedestrian questions to the applications for transportation projects.

Tami Ryall suggested that this discussion be put on future agenda.

Eric Iwersen said that he is more interested in how freeway projects are addressing bicycle and pedestrian issues because each representative on the bicycle and pedestrian committees should be internally reviewing each street project from their city before it is submitted to the TIP.

9. Next Meeting

The Pedestrian Working Group will meet on **Tuesday, February 10, 2004 at 1:30 p.m. in the Cholla Room** and the Regional Bicycle Task Force will meet on **March 16, 2004 at 1:30 p.m. in the Cholla Room.**